

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed May 18, 2004. At that time, claims 1-40 were pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 15-17, 31, and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,192,241 issued to Reed et al. (hereinafter "Reed"). The Examiner also rejected claims 11 and 31 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Examiner has also acknowledged that claims 1-10, 18-30, and 38-40 are allowed. Finally, the Examiner objected to claims 12-14 and 32-34 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

By this paper, claims 11, 13, 31, and 33 have been amended and claims 12, 15-17, 32, 35-37 canceled. Additionally, the specification has been amended. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, allowance of claims 1-11, 13-14, 18-31, 33-34, 38-40 is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification on page 1 has been amended to reflect the issuance of the parent application as U.S. Patent No. 6,615,756.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11, 15-17, 31, AND 35-37

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 15-17, 31, and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed and also rejected claims 11 and 31 under obviousness-type double patenting. Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 12, which the Examiner noted as containing allowable subject matter. Office Action page 4. As a result, claim 12 has been canceled and claim 13 has been amended to depend from independent claim 11. In addition, claim 31 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 32, which the Examiner noted as containing allowable subject matter. *Id.* Therefore, claim 32 has been canceled and claim 33 has also been amended to depend from independent claim 31.


Appl. No. 10/657,581
Amdt. dated June 16, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2004

Additionally, claims 15-17 and 35-37 have been canceled. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the remaining claims in this application is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig J. Madson
Reg. No. 29,407
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 16, 2004

MADSON & METCALF
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/537-1700